

We are sent here to do a job, Mr. President; to take tough votes. We are sent here to do what is right for America. If what is right for America is to increase our dependence on imported oil from Saddam Hussein, well, that is beyond my interpretation of what is right for America.

I look at Saddam Hussein as an enemy. He is attempting to shoot down our airplanes. We are enforcing a no-fly zone. We continue to do that. It is in our national interest. Why should we be importing more and more oil from him? Oil is fungible. If we spilled oil on the desk of the Presiding Officer, it would spill all over the table. If we buy the oil from Saddam Hussein today, we could buy oil from OPEC and let somebody else buy Saddam Hussein's oil. That is one way to dodge this so-called inconsistent bullet. But we don't seem to be doing it.

This Senator is going to—probably on the Jordan bill—bring up an amendment again to terminate our purchase of oil from Iraq. To me, it is absolutely inconsistent that we would depend on that source. It addresses our national security. The national security of this country should not be 56-percent dependent on imported oil.

One thing that continues to frustrate me a little bit is the assumption by many that oil simply comes out of the gas station. You go down there and insert your credit card and fill your tank, and there is very little consideration that somebody has to produce it; that it has to be refined; that it has to be transported; and America and the world move on oil.

We get complacent and somehow we are concerned about electricity. We have a lot of alternatives for electricity. We have hydro, nuclear, natural gas, and coal. But America moves by oil. We have an opportunity to relieve our dependence—not that we are going to eliminate it, but we can relieve it—by coming to America, to my State of Alaska, where we have the technology to do it safely. Again, Mr. President, I will keep this in the perspective of reality. This is a pretty small footprint—about 2,000 acres out of 19 million acres. That is the size of the State of South Carolina. That is what we can do with the technology we have. It is just beyond me that Members fail to want to discuss the merits. They fail to discuss why we should not do it. They are uncomfortable with the issue.

Again, that is not why we were sent here. We were sent here to make hard decisions and vote in the best interest of America. To me, to relieve our dependence on imported oil addresses specifically our national security interest. It is an issue that is coming before this body. It is going to be before the Energy Committee of which I am the ranking member.

I hope Senator BINGAMAN and I, in that committee, can have spirited debates on the specific merits of why it is not in the interest of the United States

and our national security to relieve our dependence on these increased sources of oil from the cartels of OPEC, to try to develop sources here at home, keep the jobs at home.

Look at the balance of payments—over half of the balance of payments is the cost of imported oil. We can reduce that. So why should America's labor sources not come to grips with this and begin to lobby it, as they are successfully doing? So this issue is an issue that is timely, an issue that should be addressed fully in an extended debate based on science, not emotion. The emotional arguments have prevailed. They have prevailed very strongly because of an organized, extreme environmental group that fails to recognize that this energy crisis is not going to be solved alone by alternatives, renewables, new technology, solar, wind.

This energy crisis is going to have to be resolved by a balanced process, where we advance, if you will, funding for these new technologies, but they alone can't solve the problem. We are going to have to increase clean coal utilization. We are going to have to address what to do with nuclear waste in this country because nuclear provides us with 22 percent of the energy in this Nation. We are going to have to recognize that we are now using our natural gas reserves faster than we are finding new ones, and we are going to have to again address the realities associated with the generation of electricity from our hydro sources, many of which have not been expanded to any great extent. We are going to need a comprehensive bill, with technology, alternatives, renewables, but it has to have an increased supply. Otherwise, we will go through what we did in 1992 and we will fail. The American people will hold us accountable, as they should.

ANWR is not the total answer, by any means, but it is part of the solution to regaining our independence, reducing the vulnerability of this country, and recognizing that these are real jobs to be created right here at home. I think my friend brought me a chart relative to the ownership by the Native people of Alaska. I started with this, and I think it is appropriate that in the broad scheme of things, the interest of many of the residents is forgotten.

This is the 1002 area here. We have a pointer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I ask unanimous consent for another minute and a half.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. This is a million and a half acres of the 1002 area. We have here in white the ownership by the residents of Kaktovik. This is 92,000 acres. As you can see, you have no way out. This is all Federal land. In the selection of their Native lands when they had the original village up here, a location that has been there for many centuries, under the land claims legislation, the provision was they could not

develop these lands until Congress had made a determination specifically on what to do with this area. Only Congress has the authority to open it up. These residents sit here in an enclave with private land they cannot develop. They cannot even drill for natural gas to heat their homes. That is an injustice. That would be corrected, among many other things, by this legislation that we propose in opening up ANWR.

I thank the Chair for the time allotted me and allowing me to extend my remarks.

I tell everybody that I look forward to a very spirited debate with enough time so we can get into the meat of this issue. I encourage my colleagues who say, "I am sorry, I can't support it," to start giving us reasons why, other than just the rhetoric associated with it.

I yield the floor.

EMERGENCY AGRICULTURAL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 2001—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The matter before the Senate is the motion to proceed to the consideration of S. 1246.

The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I understand the parliamentary situation is we are now on the motion to proceed to the agricultural supplemental bill. Is that right?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is on the motion to proceed.

Mr. HARKIN. We are on the motion to proceed to the Emergency Agricultural Assistance Act of 2001?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HARKIN. The vote on the motion to invoke cloture will take place at what time, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. At 5:30 p.m. today there will be a vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed.

Mr. HARKIN. At 5:30 today, for the benefit of all Senators, there will be a vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to the emergency agricultural assistance bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HARKIN. I thank the Presiding Officer for clarifying that.

As chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee, I will take this time to discuss what is in this bill and why we should proceed to the bill and not wait any longer.

We have this week to finish, and I understand then the Senate and the House will be going out for the month of August, at the end of this week. This bill really ought to be done this week. Then we have to go to conference with the House, bring the conference report back and send it on to the President. I am hopeful we will do that because most of the monies that are provided in this bill, which are allocated by the Budget Committee, really do need to get out. The fiscal 2001 funds need to

get out prior to September 30. It will take awhile to get the money out in September, although I have information that certainly the Department of Agriculture can get this money out in the month of September.

However, if we have to come back in September to complete action on this bill and then go to conference, back and forth, then there might be a problem. We do have to get this bill done this week, and that is why I am sorry some in the leadership on the Republican side decided to engage in extended debate on the motion to proceed. Otherwise, we would be on the bill right now.

In about 3 hours we will invoke cloture and then be on the bill, and hopefully we can wrap it up very soon.

The need for assistance to America's farmers and ranchers, and the communities in which they live, is very critical. Without the assistance in this bill, tens of thousands of farmers and ranchers are in danger of going out of business. This package is designed to do the best we can to address the many problems in agriculture across the Nation while staying within the limitations of the budget resolution.

I want to underscore that. This package is in full compliance with the budget resolution. There are no points of order that will lie against this bill because it is in accordance with the budget. It is fully in accordance with the budget resolution.

If we compare today's market situation for the crop sector with what it was in the mid-1990s, crop farmers are expected to receive at least \$16.7 billion less in net income based on both lower farm prices and higher input costs. The help from existing Government payments only makes up about half that gap, leaving a financial shortfall of a little over \$8.5 billion. That is compared to where it was in the mid-1990s.

This package we will have, we hope, before us this evening will offer direct payments and other benefits to a range of crop producers, but it still will not make up that entire gap. Even with this package, farmers, in terms of their net income, adjusting for inflation, will not be where they were in the mid-1990s.

Farmers are in dire need of assistance. The bill we have before us provides considerably more assistance than the House bill. It is a substantial package, and it is considerably larger than the House bill.

Again, I point out the needs are great and they are urgent. Crop prices are low. Production expenses have gone up sharply. Farmers are in the classic cost-price squeeze.

I do not want to cite all the provisions in the bill, but I would like to mention a few. We have included in the bill funding for the full level of market loss assistance that was provided last year. That means this bill will provide an additional payment in September at the rate of the 1999 Freedom to Farm payment for feed grains, wheat, rice,

and cotton. That is what it was last year, and it will be the same this year.

I want to make it very clear: I am not a big fan of the AMTA payment mechanism which is used for the market loss assistance payments. I believe there are real inequities in that formula, and we must change it in the next farm bill.

Our staff and I looked very carefully at whether there could be an alternative payment mechanism for putting out the assistance before September 30 other than the AMTA formula. However, in view of this short timeframe for USDA to get the payments out and some other factors, the best available approach under the circumstances is to use the same market loss payment approach that has been used in recent years.

The inequities have been in this since the start of the 1996 farm bill, the so-called Freedom to Farm bill. The market loss assistance payments were based on the AMTA formula, and basically this formula went back some 20 years to look at what the base acreage was in those basic commodities of feed grains, wheat, cotton, and rice.

It was based upon the production pattern at that time and based on a percentage of the base acreage, times the established yield, times the set price that is in the Freedom to Farm bill, which equaled the payment.

Here is where the inequity arises: Let us say we were neighboring farmers. My farm was in Northern Iowa and the Presiding Officer's was in southern Minnesota, right across the boundary, the same farming. Let us say that 20 years ago I decided I was going to put all my land in corn. I was not going to get involved in crop rotations. I just planted everything fence row to fence row of corn. So my base got high.

The Presiding Officer, on the other hand, decided the best way to farm would be to involve himself in crop rotations, maybe a corn/bean-type rotation, or one involving hay and pasture. He decided it would be good to put in buffer strips or grassed headlands.

That was 20 years ago. Let us advance to right now. Let us say now, however, the Presiding Officer and I are planting the same crop mix of corn and soybeans. We both have the same acreage of corn today, but because I planted so much 20 years ago and the Presiding Officer did not, I get more money from the Government because of what I did 20 years ago. That is an inequity. Farmers who practiced good crop rotations and conservation are penalized. Those that planted continuous corn or another crop get the highest payment. It is not fair.

We also found other inequities. Some receive market loss assistance payments who are not even planting any of the grains—they did 20 years ago—but because they established their base 20 years ago they can be doing something else entirely, and they are still getting that payment. Yet another farmer who doesn't have that base history may be receiving nothing or very little.

The AMTA payment mechanism is inequitable and has been since the beginning. It ought to be changed.

In view of the short timeframe we have in getting money out before the end of September, there was no other way to do it. Hopefully, we will be able to change that in the next farm bill.

The present farm bill has one more year to run. Before we get to that mechanism next year, we should come up with a different mechanism.

There are a few other areas of importance. The bill has full funding for soybean and other oil seeds payments at last year's level; also money for cotton seed and peanut farmers; funding to help the specialty crop producers with assistance for commodity purchases and special assistance for apple producers. However, in this bill, the funds for specialty crops in terms of market loss assistance amount to \$420 million. This amount, some say, is a lot. It is nearly identical to the \$416 million we provided specialty crop producers in crop insurance and appropriations bills last year.

America's apple growers are experiencing the worst economic losses in more than 70 years, having lost \$1.5 billion since 1996, an estimated \$500 million during the past year alone. Current apple prices, which are as low as 40 percent below the cost of production, are driving many of our family farmers out of existence. The average prices received by growers for fresh market apples in March of this year were the lowest in more than 10 years, 31 percent below prices in March 1999, 29 percent below the 5-year average.

Again, apple farmers need some help. Quite frankly, what could be more healthful for our population and especially for our kids in school than an "apple a day to keep the doctor away," as our mothers used to say. We have a commodity that is healthful, helps prevent illness and disease, yet the people who grow them are in serious financial trouble. I thought it was important in this bill to provide some help and support for apple farmers who are in dire straits.

We also provide in the bill nutrition-related assistance mainly through helping provide commodities for schoolchildren, families, and seniors in need.

The package includes a substantial commitment to agricultural conservation. Several of these programs are out of money. This package puts much needed funding into the conservation programs. There is funding for technical assistance that allows the Conservation Reserve Program to go forward. It has no money for fiscal 2002 presently. There is funding for the Wetlands Reserve Program, the Environmental Quality Incentives Program, the Wildlife Habitat Incentive Program, and the Farmland Protection Program. Basically, it provides four conservation programs with funds. The demand exceeds the amount of funding by a factor of 5 or 6. In other words,

there are five times more applications, applications that are approved, for the Wetlands Reserve Program than we have the money for.

Some may ask, why fund them in this bill? The answer is, if we wait to fund them until later, several of the programs will lie dormant in fiscal year 2002 for several months, at least, pending a new farm bill or other legislation. We don't know when that may be completed.

Keep in mind, the conservation provisions in the bill reported out of our committee constitute only 7 percent of the total package. I don't think that is too much to ask.

Many farmers are hurting. Of course, we have the market loss assistance payments which I described as inequitable in many cases for many farmers practicing good conservation that don't have a high base. These conservation payments do two things. They help support their income, but it also provides a benefit for everyone in cleaning up our water and our air and saving soil. In that way, it is as much as an emergency need to those farmers and to us as the market loss assistance payments. Surely we can afford 7 percent of the entire bill to care for our land and water and deal with the critical conservation and environmental challenges in agriculture.

For fiscal year 2002, CBO estimates conservation spending will be about 12 percent of USDA mandatory farm program spending. Adding \$542 million, as we have in this bill, to the fiscal year 2002 spending on conservation, only raises that share to 13.5 percent. That is a very modest increase at best and still much less than is needed. Even with the money we included, of all of the USDA mandatory farm spending program, it will only be 13.5 percent next year for conservation.

In 1985, I believe about 97 percent of our funding for conservation went to farmers on working lands and 3 percent went to land taken out of production. Today, I believe it is about 85 percent that goes for land out of production and 15 percent on working lands, overall, of all the conservation funding. What we are trying to do is get that balance a little bit more oriented to helping farmers actually working the land rather than just taking it totally out of production.

I strongly believe we have a balanced package, one I hope will receive broad support in the Senate. It has been crafted to address needs across the country, from Florida to Washington State and from Maine to New Mexico and California. It has also been crafted to address the needs on both sides of the aisle.

I come back to the issue of the budget and spending. We will hear a lot of debate about this on the floor this evening and tomorrow. Hopefully we can wrap up this bill up yet this evening.

The budget resolution as adopted by the Congress provides for the Agri-

culture Committee to spend up to \$5.5 billion in assistance to farmers in fiscal year 2001, which ends September 30th this year. That is what we have done. We have not gone over that. We have put \$5.5 billion into the bill for 2001.

The Budget Committee also allows the Agriculture Committee to spend up to \$7.35 billion next year, in fiscal year 2002, starting October 1st.

The Budget Committee did not say to the Agriculture Committee: You can't meet and decide how to spend it until after October 1st. We just cannot write legislation that outlays the money before October 1st.

Now, a budget point of order would lie if we wanted to take that \$7.35 billion and move it to before September 30th. We didn't do that. As we all know, we said we will spend the \$5.5 billion this year, but because the needs are great and the fiscal year and the crop year don't coincide, we decided to meet in the committee and determine how to spend \$2 billion of next year's money next year. So the \$2 billion we decided to spend will be spent after October 1 of this year, in fiscal year 2002, and it is in full accordance with what the Budget Committee allowed us to do. Again, I point out the Budget Committee did not say to the Agriculture Committee: You cannot meet and you cannot decide how to spend that money this year. They just said: You cannot obligate it until after October 1. That is what we did.

We met. We saw the need, and we said we are going to spend \$2 billion of that after October 1, which is fully allowed under the budget resolution. There is no shifting from one fiscal year into another.

I heard it in the committee when we were debating this in the committee and I have heard other people on the floor refer to the fact that we have gone way over what the budget resolution allowed; the budget resolution allowed us \$5.5 billion and we are up to about \$7.5 billion in this bill.

I will continue to say as often as I can—it looks like I am going to have to say it a lot in the next few hours—we spend \$5.5 billion in this year as the budget resolution allows. We spend \$2 billion next year as the budget resolution allows. That is all we have done. We have the authority to do that. We are completely within the budget to do that.

Again, regarding the use of fiscal year 2002 funds, this package simply reflects the reality of the difference between crop years and fiscal years. Most of the cost of farm programs associated with the crops this year, the crop that is in the ground in many of our States right now, some are being harvested—in wheat country, for example, some of the smaller grains are being harvested. Up in our area, we have not started yet, but that will happen this fall—but most of the crops are in the ground. The impact of the low prices will not really be felt until next fiscal year,

2002. That is just how farm programs work.

I simply cannot see the problem in using some part of the fiscal 2002 money to help agricultural producers deal with the problems of the 2001 crop year. That is all we have done. We have done it in a way that is in accordance with the budget.

Again, contrary to some of the arguments, we are not spending up next year's money. We are saving most of it to be spent at a later time. What we are spending is being used for its intended purpose: to fund programs within the Agriculture Committee's jurisdiction. So we had \$7.35 billion for the next fiscal year. We have spent in this bill before us \$2 billion of that \$7.35 billion. That leaves about \$5.35 billion for next year that we can use, either separate and apart by itself, or we can fold it into the farm bill if, in fact, we do pass a farm bill later this year.

Let's discuss the package before the Senate today compared with what we did last year. In last year's crop insurance bill, there was a farm assistance package that included \$5.5 billion for fiscal year 2000, plus an added \$1.64 billion for fiscal year 2001. So the total package we passed last year was about \$7.1 billion. This year's package is in that ballpark. It is a little bit higher, but really very close to what we did last year.

I just ask the rhetorical question: How could it have been fiscally responsible to provide that level of assistance last year, but it is irresponsible to provide that level of assistance this year?

When it comes to America's crop producers across the country, their situation has not improved and probably has worsened during the last year. So the need is still there. The package is very similar in size to last year. If the situation is every bit as bad as last year, and we have a package of a similar size to last year, I cannot understand any objection to this.

Again, there is a similarity to last year, but there is also a difference. When we approved a package of over \$7 billion last year, we had nothing left over the next year in the budget resolution; that is, we enacted a bill during fiscal year 2000 and we used both fiscal year 2000 money and fiscal year 2001 money and we left zero dollars for 2001. That is what happened last year.

This year, however, we are spending fiscal year 2001 money, a portion of 2002 money, and we will have \$5.35 billion left over for next fiscal year, which we did not do last year. So, again, I repeat for emphasis sake: We now have \$5.5 billion to spend before September 30 on farm assistance. We have already that much left for the remainder of fiscal year 2002. So we are, with this package, maintaining a budgetary position for fiscal 2002 very similar to the one we have for this year.

Some will say: Should we now be spending the money that could be saved for the new farm bill? First, because of the difference between crop-

years and fiscal years, spending on the new farm bill will really focus on fiscal year 2003 and later years, not fiscal year 2002. The farm bill we are under right now runs through next year. It runs through next year. So if our committee is going to be fashioning a new farm bill, really it is going to be focusing on 2003 and beyond, not for fiscal year 2002.

So, again, if those who say that \$7.35 billion should be left for the farm bill, are they saying that none of it should be spent next year? They are going to put it in 2003? There are a lot of farmers going to go broke next year if that is the case, and we will be in dire straits next year.

Again, what we have tried to do is provide a smooth transition from this fiscal year to the next crop-year, and then to the next year beyond that when we will have a new farm bill. Whether the money is spent on a new farm bill or not, the objectives are the same: to meet the needs of farm and ranch families and address other priorities of farm policy. There are many farmers in this country who cannot wait for a new farm bill; they need the help right now. They are struggling to hang on. If we can get them some immediate help while saving some funds for the next farm bill, which we are doing, that seems to me to be the right thing to do.

I want to take a moment to discuss a letter from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget concerning this legislation. In that letter, Mr. Daniels says he will recommend the President not sign a bill providing more than \$5.5 billion in additional assistance for crop-year 2001.

Again, I am not certain how we read this. I read this saying we have complied with that. We provide no more than \$5.5 billion for crop-year 2001. Even though the letter refers to the 2001 crop-year, I can assume that the letter reflects some confusion between the fiscal year and the crop-year.

I just went through all that, the difference between the crop-year and a fiscal year. Maybe there was some confusion in that letter. As is commonly done, this bill includes assistance for the current crop-year, 2001.

Some of this money will be spent in fiscal year 2002, but it will help cover the shortfall to agricultural producers for crops grown in the 2001 crop and calendar year. Again, there is nothing unusual about providing assistance in the next fiscal year for crops that were, in fact, grown in an earlier numbered crop or calendar year—that is the way farm bills work. The fiscal year ends on September 30. That is not when the crop-year ends, not in my area. The crop-year doesn't end for a long time after that. Some crop-years end about that time or before that, in certain parts of the country. So you cannot just base everything on when the clock tolls on the end of the fiscal year in terms of farm assistance. We do that all the time, provide that carryover.

Again, having said that, I want to underscore that this bill is in full compliance with the budget resolution. No budget point of order lies against this bill. It is within the prerogative of the Senate to approve this legislation. It is within the prerogative of the Agriculture Committee to both spend up to \$5.5 billion for this fiscal year, and up to \$7.35 billion for the next fiscal year.

I have to question the justification for Mr. Daniels' threat that he would recommend the President not sign this, and I must also question whether or not they are confusing crop-years and fiscal years.

Is Mr. Daniels saying that Congress will not be allowed to deliver the assistance to agriculture that is clearly provided in the budget resolution? I am sorry. The White House and OMB have no jurisdiction over that.

Is Mr. Daniels saying that the promise of assistance to farm families, which is clearly contained in the budget resolution, isn't worth the paper on which it is written? From everything I am aware of, President Bush and the White House were on board with the budget resolution that was put together by Republican majorities in the Senate and the House. That was the budget resolution which provided the wherewithal of the tax-writing committee to put through the tax bill.

I recall Republican colleagues pointing favorably to the budget resolution and agricultural funding when the budget resolution went there also. We are now being told by the White House that the President may not sign it, even though it is fully within the budget resolution.

Why? Mr. Daniels simply says \$5.5 billion is enough. That is that. Maybe it is enough until September 30.

But Mr. Daniels ought to go down and sit at some of the kitchen tables in the farmhouses and say, OK. Until September 30, and after that you are on your own.

There is a lot of assistance that will be needed after September 30. The crop-years don't pay attention to when the fiscal year ends.

Tell them that Congress won't be allowed to use the money in the budget resolution until after September 30.

Finally, I must point out that Mr. Daniels is wrong to suggest funding is not needed for conservation. I went through that a little bit ago. The facts are, if we don't provide this funding, several programs will lie dormant for a number of months before they can be funded again.

Again, it is not just payments to farmers for the loss of prices for their corn, wheat, cotton, rice, apples, and a lot of other commodities—peanuts, cottonseeds, and everything else we have. It is also to help farmers—maybe because of their planting history—who don't get much under the AMTA payments. Yet, they have been good stewards. These are good farm families. By providing them some help with conservation funding, we both are able to

help them, and we are able to help the country as a whole by providing for cleaner water, cleaner air, and less soil runoff.

This package is substantial, but it is very close to what we had last year in terms of spending. It is very close to what we had last year in terms of specialty crops. All in all, this package is not a heck of a lot different than what we had last year. It is a little bit more. Last year it was about \$7.1 billion. This year it is about \$7.5 billion. Most of that additional money is going for conservation, which is sorely needed around the country.

It is a balanced package. It is balanced regionally. It addresses a lot of urgent needs. It fits within the budget resolution. I hope we can support it. I am hopeful that any amendments seeking to change it, to shift it, or to cut down on the payments will not be successful.

Again, I am sorry we had to go through this exercise of filing cloture on the motion to proceed. We should be on the bill right now. We have been held up at least 1 day because someone in the Republican leadership on the other side decided to filibuster the motion to proceed to this emergency farm package. We had to file a cloture motion. At 5:30 today we will vote on the cloture motion on the motion to proceed. Again, I am hopeful it will be overwhelmingly approved, and that maybe yet we can even reach some agreement to wrap this bill up this evening. At least that is my desire.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. REED). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I understand that when we go into a quorum call the time should be divided equally between both sides. I ask unanimous consent that when we go back into a quorum call the time remaining be evenly divided between both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I want to talk today about the emergency supplemental bill that will be on the floor dealing with the farm problem we have in this country.

I just heard my colleague, Senator HARKIN, the chairman of the committee. I commend him for what he has

done. I think he made a great statement. I think he has written a good bill, and Congress ought to pass it posthaste.

It is rather strange that we find ourselves in this position. We are in the position of debating the motion to proceed to go to the actual bill on the floor of the Senate. Let me say that again. We are debating the motion to proceed. We are debating whether we should proceed to a bill to provide emergency help to family farmers.

I guess those who are stalling our being able to get to that bill are probably not facing, with respect to their personal income, the circumstances family farmers are facing. Soybeans have recently been at a 27-year low in price; cotton, a 25-year low; wheat and corn, a 14-year low; rice, an 8-year low. Prices have collapsed as if they had dropped off a cliff. They have stayed down for a number of years, only recovering slightly, at times.

So family farmers, who are out there in the country and have invested sweat and equity in their family farm trying to make a living, have discovered that their income has completely collapsed. This has required Congress to try to patch up a bad farm bill with emergency aid year after year after year.

We really need to write a better farm bill. I know Senator HARKIN, the chairman of the Agriculture Committee, is leading the effort to do that. I fully support him. In the meantime, we need to provide some emergency help. That is what this bill is designed to do. It is called an emergency supplemental to try to provide some help to family farms.

If one needs more insight into what is happening to our family farms, one can probably see it in the circumstances described to me by a Lutheran minister one day this past year. This Lutheran minister works in New England, ND, as the pastor of the local Lutheran church. We were talking about the struggle that family farmers are having in our country, and especially there, which is near my hometown of Regent in southwestern North Dakota.

She said to me: In our little town, where we have a shrinking population—this is a town of probably 800 people—we have about 4 funerals for every wedding I conduct as pastor of our church. Four funerals for every wedding—I was thinking to myself about that movie “Four Weddings and a Funeral.” This is just the opposite: four funerals for every wedding.

What is she saying with that data? What that means is the population in those rural areas is getting older. Young people are moving out. Family farmers are shutting down family farms because they can't make it, and those economies are just shrinking. The root of all of it is a farm program that does not work. It just isn't able to give families a feeling they can stay on the family farm and make a decent living.

We are in this Chamber today on an emergency supplemental bill to try to help family farmers. The Senate can move ahead or it does not have to move ahead. This is not like milking. If this were a dairy operation, come 5:30, if you had 80 cows that were fresh and needed to be milked, you could not sit around the house twiddling your thumbs saying: I don't think I will milk this afternoon. You would have to go to the barn and start milking those cows. If it was spring planting time, you wouldn't have the opportunity to say: I won't go spring planting this afternoon. You have to fuel up the tractor and go plant some seeds.

Farmers understand deadlines. Farmers understand that you need to get things done when it is time to get them done; this Senate ought to as well. Having to debate the motion to proceed is an outrage.

Who is stalling here? And why? We ought not have to debate the motion to proceed to an emergency supplemental bill to help family farmers. On Friday, one of my colleagues on the other side said: I am holding it up because it costs too much money. I say: You have every right to try to reduce the amount of help for family farmers. Let the bill come to the floor and then offer an amendment. If you want to cut it by \$2 billion or \$4 billion, offer that amendment, and then let's have a vote. If enough Senators vote with you, you will have cut the amount of help for family farmers. I am not going to support that, but why would you consider holding up the bill because you have your nose out of joint that it costs too much? If you think it costs too much, then offer an amendment to decrease it.

Let me say this. From my standpoint, I think this investment in family farms for this country is a bargain. A good deal deserves repeating: I think investing in families who are out there trying to make a living on the family farm is a bargain for this country in that I believe it strengthens this country.

Europe does not have this kind of internal debate. Europe decided long ago that it wants to maintain a network of family farms across Europe. Why? Because it has been hungry. It doesn't want to be hungry again. How does it prevent that? They work to preserve a network of family farmers living on the land in Europe.

Go to a small town in Europe some evening and ask yourself whether that town is alive. It is. Small towns in Europe are alive. They have life because of family farms, which are the blood vessels that flow into those communities, are doing well in Europe.

In this country, family farms are flat on their backs, struggling to make a living because prices have collapsed. Has anyone in this Chamber who makes an income had it reduced by 40 percent? That is what family farmers face when they discover that the price for their crop has collapsed. They put

the seed in the ground in the spring. They pray that nothing is going to happen to it: no insects, no hail, no excessive rain, but enough rain. They pray that nothing bad is going to happen. Then they harvest it in the fall and they put it on a truck and take it to the elevator, only to be told that in a world that is hungry, with 500 million people going to bed every night with an ache in their belly because it hurts to be hungry, they are told: Your food doesn't have any value, Mr. Farmer. They wonder about the value contained in that statement.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DORGAN. I am happy to yield.

Mr. REID. I was across the hall watching the presentation of the Senator from North Dakota. I had two questions I wanted to ask him.

Did I understand the Senator correctly when I heard him say that the Senator from Idaho said he didn't like this bill because it was too much money, and the Senator from North Dakota responded, if that is the case, let us go ahead and debate the bill and offer an amendment that it is too much? Is that what you said?

Mr. DORGAN. That is what I said. This bill isn't too much money. It is within the framework of what we decided as a Congress that we were going to spend on the budget. It spends the required amount in this fiscal year, and then \$2 billion in the next fiscal year. It does not violate the budget.

The point I was making was that real income for family farmers has fallen to the level of the 1930s. This is the real income achieved by farmers out there who are struggling to raise a family and run a farm. It is clearly an emergency. We have clearly brought to the floor legislation that does not violate the Budget Act. Yet even though it is an emergency supplemental, we can't get to the bill. We have to debate today a motion to proceed to the bill.

I am outraged by the fact that there is stalling on a bill that represents a clear response to an emergency in American farm country.

Mr. REID. Another question I will ask the Senator from North Dakota: Nevada is a State that has some agricultural interests. We have a few green belts, not many. Those we have are very important to the State.

Agriculture is the No. 1 industry in North Dakota; is that right?

Mr. DORGAN. In North Dakota, which is a rural State, agriculture is 40 percent of the State's economy. It is clearly the 500-pound gorilla of economic activity in States such as North Dakota. But it is not just North Dakota, it is Montana, Minnesota, Wyoming, Nebraska, South Dakota, and Iowa. There is a whole heartland in this country whose economies are supported by agriculture, by family farm producers.

Mr. REID. I have served in the House with the Senator from North Dakota and also in the Senate. It is difficult

for those of us who are not from farm States to comprehend what a family farm is. I have heard you say on a number of occasions how the family farms are disappearing.

Would this bill, if we don't pass it in a timely fashion, force other family farmers to go out of business?

Mr. DORGAN. There is no question that will be the case. There isn't any question if we don't provide a bridge, and quickly—between the current inadequate farm bill and a new farm bill that tries to provide a decent safety net and a bridge across price depressions—there isn't any question that family farmers in a number of cases around the country will not be allowed to continue. These are people who are more than just in this for a business. These are people for whom family farming is their life. It is all they know. It is what they do. It is what they want to do.

There is so much value in family farming in a country. Farmers produce much more than just wheat or corn or soybeans. They produce communities. They produce cultural value. It is a seed bed for family values that moves from family farm to small towns to big cities. It is such an enormous contribution to the country. That is why, as I mentioned, in Europe they decided long ago that the kind of economy they want is an economy that has healthy family farm agriculture—a network of producers living on the land throughout Europe producing their food. We should make a similar commitment and write a farm bill that does that.

In the meantime, this emergency supplemental is the bridge to get from here to there. I do hope beyond this afternoon we are not further delayed by anyone stalling with what clearly is an emergency piece of legislation designed to reach the extended hand out to say to family farmers that we are here to help during tough times.

Mr. REID. I say to the Senator from North Dakota, I appreciate his bringing up the family values that we have in farm States.

Our friend, Pat Moynihan, who just left the Senate, used to say that to have good scores on tests for students, high school students, you should just move them near the Canadian border, North Dakota, South Dakota, States along the border, the farm States. The kids do better than anywhere in the country with their tests; is that true?

Mr. DORGAN. That is the case. We have some of the highest tests, education tests in the country. It has a lot to do not so much with the specific teachers or the specific schools, but it has to do with the family values of family farms and small towns and rural life. That is not to denigrate any value that anyone else has. It is simply to say that the kind of family values that spring from a rural State produce good achievement in education.

There was a wonderful author who has since died, world-renowned author, actually grew up in Fargo, ND, and

lived in New York and London before he died. He wrote a number of books. His name was Richard Critchfield. He wrote books that described the rolling of family values in this country's history in two centuries, the rolling family values from family farms to small towns to big cities, and the refreshment and nurturing of the value system in the country by having that happen.

I grew up in a town of 400 people—not quite 400, between 300 and 400 people. We raised livestock and other things. But I understood what those values meant when a fellow named Ernest died of a heart attack with his crop out there needing to be harvested. All the neighbors showed up and harvested the crop. It is like the old barn raising, the neighbor-to-neighbor help in which they form communities. Those values by which people form communities to help them through tough times are very important values for the country.

That is why I came to the floor to talk about this legislation. It is money to be sure, but that money represents a bridge. There are very few people in the country who have seen a total collapse of their income the way family farmers have. The income for their work and the income for the measure of their effort is down 40 percent, 50 percent from what it used to be. How many businesses or how many enterprises in this country are getting 1930s level income in real dollars? That is what is happening to family farmers. It is unfathomable to me that we are such a strong country in terms of having this aspiration to build a national missile defense along with all these technologies. We are doing all these things, yet we have 500,000 people who go to bed every night hungry as the Dickens.

We have this food in such abundant quantity, yet we can't find the way to connect the two so that family farmers have a chance to make a living and people who are hungry have an opportunity for a better life. There is something that is not connecting very well in this country on this policy. That is why I want us to write a better farm bill. In the meantime, we must have this bridge to get there. The bridge is this bill, an emergency supplemental bill that provides about \$5.5 billion in this fiscal year, and roughly \$2 billion, slightly less, in the next fiscal year, to help family farmers over these troubled times.

Mr. REID. One last question of the Senator: We know how important agriculture is. We are the breadbasket of the world. And it is important that we do something in this emergency supplemental bill. We were asked by the Chair to withhold. Another bill was brought by the House of Representatives, the Export Administration Act, which has passed the House. All they did was continue the bill that is now in existence, which is also a disaster for the high-tech industry.

The Senator knows that the high-tech industry has a number of things

they need to remain competitive. One is to make sure we pass legislation that modernizes the ability of these high-tech companies to export things that are now sold in Radio Shack that, under present law, they can't do.

I want my friend to comment on what he sees happening here in the Senate. I reflect back to last year, when we were in the minority, we passed by the August recess eight appropriations bills. We have now passed three because, as you know, they have been slow-walking the Transportation appropriations bill, and we hope we are fortunate enough to get the VA-HUD bill. We must do something on this emergency bill that we are now trying to get before the Senate on agriculture. We also need to do the Export Administration Act. I think my friend will agree that it will allow the high-tech industry to stop exporting jobs overseas and do them here so they can manufacture equipment here, sell it overseas, and not have to move their businesses overseas to manufacture equipment over there. But we are not going to be able to do that, it appears. It looks as if the House is satisfied with extending the act that is already in existence, which the industry says doesn't do us any good at all.

Will my friend comment on what is happening in the Senate with these things?

Mr. DORGAN. The Senator from Nevada, I think, knows the answer to this question. Not very much is happening in the Senate, regrettably. We have a large amount to do, yet this place has been slowed down. Last week, it was sort of a parade-in-rest all week because people didn't want the Senate to get its work done. Trying to get something done in the Senate is like trying to walk through wet cement. It is pretty hard going. It is not as if there is not a lot to do and there are not a lot of pieces of legislation that need doing now.

The emergency supplemental to help family farmers passed the House, out of the Agriculture Committee. But are we on the bill? No. Why? Because we are debating a motion to proceed. What is going on here, when we have to debate the motion to proceed to deal with an emergency bill to help family farmers?

There can't be a lot of thinking going on about this. Senator DASCHLE is trying to create an agenda that says let's get our work done and get it done soon. Everybody ought to have the opportunity for full debate. For nearly 2 days last week, this Senate sat in session with nobody coming over to offer substantive amendments, but an objection to going to third reading to pass the Transportation bill. Essentially, the Senate was shut down. We have all these things to do, and we have so much ahead of us, yet people think it is somehow to their advantage to slow this place down.

The Senate has never been accused of speeding, in the first place. This is a deliberate body, the place where we deliberate for long periods of time. There

is no excuse under any condition to force us to have to debate a motion to proceed. That is unthinkable, in my view.

In addition, when we get this done, we have to finish the Department of Transportation bill, the VA-HUD and independent agencies bill; and if we get all that done, we will still come up far short of what we need to do. It is not because Senator DASCHLE has not said here is what we need to do, it is because we have some people sitting on the back seat of this bicycle built for two and putting the brakes on. All we want is a little cooperation.

The Senator asks me what is happening here in the Senate. Regrettably, not much. This afternoon, nothing. We are debating the motion to proceed on an emergency bill. I have never seen the likes of this.

So my hope is that those who are stalling, those who are holding this up will come to the floor and say, all right, we won't hold it up anymore. Let's go have our votes and get these pieces of legislation passed. The Senate can do better than this.

Mr. President, I reserve time for others who want to speak on this bill. I yield the floor.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DAYTON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, in due course we will be debating a very important bill for American agriculture. As the distinguished chairman of our committee, Senator HARKIN, has pointed out, the needs of farmers throughout our country are evident to most Senators. In fact, all Senators, I suspect, share an empathy for attempting to do what we can to help.

I want to take these moments, before we get into the substance of the debate, to describe the problem as I see it; the reason the Ag Committee and the Senate and our compatriots in the House of Representatives have taken this up.

To begin with, however, I simply want to make a comment with regard to the colloquy I heard in the Chamber a short time ago suggesting delay with regard to the agriculture situation. The comments of our distinguished colleagues really related to more than agriculture, and other bills certainly have a different track, but in the case of this supplemental bill to help American farmers, the House of Representatives passed legislation on June 26. It was not until July 25 that legislation came before our Agriculture Committee. There was almost a month intervening.

I do not charge delay. There are many things in the lives of Senators,

many activities in the life of the Senate Agriculture Committee, but I simply point out that at any time from June 26 on we could have acted, even if we were to adopt, for example, the House bill, obviating a conference, and to move on to assist farmers within this fiscal year.

As the distinguished majority leader pointed out last Friday evening at the termination of debate, there is a technical problem of cutting the checks physically and getting the money to farmers by September 30, and that is one reason that the urgency of this bill is apparent to most of us. My own guess is as we approach the cloture vote on the motion to proceed at 5:30 this evening, there will be surely almost a unanimous vote, if not a unanimous vote, to proceed. I think we all understand that.

To suggest on our side we have been delaying action for agriculture would be inaccurate. Perhaps that was not even implied. Putting that aside, the fact is we have had packages of this variety now for the last 3 years.

I just want to review, for the benefit of Senators as well as for the American people, some of the assumptions behind these supplemental packages that arrive at this point in time or sometimes even earlier in the year.

Essentially, we had a very good year in American agriculture in 1996. For a variety of reasons, a lot of income that may have been delayed by events in the world and other circumstances that led to very strong export markets led to a net farm income in 1996 of \$54.9 billion.

If we look at the year before in 1995, it was only \$37 billion. An average of those 2 years would lead to something between \$45 billion and \$46 billion. Nevertheless, in 1996, often mentioned in debates because it was an extraordinary year, it was also the year we passed a farm bill. The thoughts are perhaps we were carried away by the euphoria of that situation. I doubt whether anyone was carried away, but nevertheless it was a good year.

Generally, the years came into something else. In 1997, net farm income was \$48.6 billion, down well over \$6 billion really from the previous year; then in 1998, \$44.7 billion; and in 1999, \$43.4 billion.

In those last 2 years, the \$44.7 and the \$43.4 billion, these figures would have been lower still except for the fact we plugged in some income, a supplemental bill just like the one we are discussing now. Those monies brought things to about a \$45 billion level.

We can ask, why \$45 billion? Because that seemed to be a general average. Those observing the debate should say: Are we saying this is a plus-\$45 billion, American agriculture made \$45 million? I am saying that. This was always a plus, never a deficit. In no year was there a net farm loss. It was always a net farm gain, and it was substantial.

As we started this particular year, as a matter of fact, even the latest estimate by the U.S. Department of Agri-

culture is that without action by this body the net farm income in 2001 would be \$42.4 billion. That is roughly the same figure the Budget Committees of the Senate and the House had earlier in the year when they had an extended budget debate. They knew that somewhere in the \$41 billion to \$42 billion level net farm income would come out about that way for 2001.

They knew we had taken action in the past to bring things up somewhere in the \$45 billion area, comparable to the years before. We did not quite succeed in 1999 at \$43.4 billion, but we did succeed in 2000 at \$45.3 billion.

They came to a figure by their deliberations in debate in the Budget Committee that \$5.5 billion was about the right size to plug the gap. If this, in fact, were adopted, the \$42.4 billion estimated plus the \$5.5 billion should come out somewhere around \$47.9 billion. That would be about \$2.5 billion more than 2000. It would turn out, in effect, to be about \$4.5 billion more than 1999. As a matter of fact, it would be very close to the \$48.6 billion in 1997, really exceeded only by the banner year of 1996 which, if averaged with the year before that, came out somewhere in the \$45 billion to \$46 billion level.

Americans outside of agriculture looking into this would say: Is this done for people in the electronics industry or retail stores generally in America, or struggling manufacturing firms, or anybody? The answer is: No, there is no other business in America that takes a look at net income for the whole group of people doing it, every entity collected in these figures, and says we want to make you whole, at least whole at a level of a multiyear picture.

This is the only situation of that sort. It is not by chance. Those of us who are involved in farming, and I have been one of them—my family has been involved for generations. I think it is fair to say that in terms of the truth and being upfront about this bill and this advocacy. I know the distinguished Senator from Iowa, Mr. GRASSLEY, and his family have a farm in Iowa. When he served on the Agriculture Committee, he and I, I believe were the only two involved in these farm programs to keep the books, to make the marketing decisions, to either have to borrow money and repay it or distribute whatever profits there are to our family members. This bill is one that my farm, 604 acres in Marion County, IN, will have to live with, or benefit from, as the case may be.

I understand intimately what these figures mean. I am not an advocate for clients or just trying to do good for the farmers I have met in my States. I am one of them, a member of the Farm Bureau, a regular at whatever meeting farmers call.

I am sympathetic with the thought that if we are truly interested in family farmers, in retaining farmers in agriculture, we ought to move on this legislation. I will vote for cloture so we

can proceed. I will try to work with my distinguished friend, TOM HARKIN, chairman of our committee, to come to a constructive result in this debate. It is important. It is timely.

Having said that, it is also unique. What has occurred in the evolution of the current farm bill is a quest on the part of the Senate and the House and the President to save every family farmer, every single entity in American agriculture. That is the purpose of filling the gap, of making certain net farm income stays at a level comparable to years before.

To a great extent we have succeeded. One of the interesting aspects of the same agricultural report that has net farm income is a discussion of farm equity. By that, I mean the U.S. Department of Agriculture has pulled together the total assets of all of American agriculture and the total liabilities and has come to a conclusion in this year of 2001. As it stands, total farm equity, net worth, all the farms in America, will be \$954 billion. That will be up from \$941 billion in 2000. That was higher than \$940 billion in 1999, or \$912 billion in 1998, or \$887 billion in 1997, or \$848 billion clear back in the golden year of 1996. In fact, the annual increase in the equity of American agriculture has been 3.2 percent over the period of 1995 to the year 2000.

If one asked, how can that be, given the stories of failing farms, of desperate people all over our country, how is it conceivable that given a whole group of farmers, whatever they are doing, in livestock or grain or the specialty crops, so far there has been a gain in equity. This is true in large part because through our policies, through the supplemental bills, we have almost guaranteed an income for agriculture in America, and at a fairly high level.

One of the dilemmas of this is because of this prosperity—and I say that advisedly, at a 3.2-percent increase in equity over the course of time; in fact, the land prices in that same period have risen on average of 4.6 percent a year countrywide—there is not a region of the country that did not have an overall percentage change in land values that was positive between 1996 and the year 2000—every single part of our country, some a little stronger than others. I note, for example, strangely enough, in the Appalachian region, a 6.3-percent gain in land values on an annual basis throughout that period of time. In the Lake States, an 8-percent change. In the Northeast, only a 2.8-percent change in agricultural lands. But everyone gained.

The dilemma, having said that, and this is why I coupled these two figures—net farm income, roughly \$45 billion on an average; net worth of American agriculture, about \$954 billion, more or less—if you take those figures, you come out with a figure of roughly 4.5 to 5 percent as the return on invested capital, the invested capital being the net worth, the equity, the

net income being the 45, and maybe this year 48 as it turns out.

When I have talked to farm bureau meetings, on occasion the question has arisen: LUGAR, what kind of return do you get on your farm? Why are you still involved in this? I have recited that over the 45 years I have managed our farm, 1956 to the present, we have had roughly a net gain on worth of 4 percent a year on the value of the farm. We have not always gotten 4 percent every year, but nevertheless we made money in all 45 years, and the average return has been 4 percent.

Many say that sounds a little too high to me; I have not been getting 4 percent. I said, we have been fortunate, perhaps. That is not out of line with what appears to be the case with American agriculture across the board—apparently, a return on net worth of about 4.5 to 5 percent.

Outside of agriculture meetings, people say, well, something is missing; you could have gotten 6 or 7 percent on 30-year Treasury bonds throughout this whole period of time and not taken any risk with regard to the weather, exports, or the vagaries of Congress or whatever else might have happened. That is true. In fact, for most people involved in investment, a return over a long period of time of 4 to 5 percent does not appear to be particularly attractive. That is why we are always likely to have agricultural debates with regard to money.

The difficult secret of this is the business does not pay very much. If you are an entrepreneur and you want to go into electronics or into a dot-com situation or whatever venture capital has taken a look at in recent years, the odds are you looked for a much more attractive rate of making your money grow faster.

As I mentioned earlier, I plead guilty to 45 years of staying with this because I like it. That is why people farm. They want to do it. They love the land. They love the lifestyle. They have some reverence for their dads, their grandfathers, the people involved in it. They want to save it, perpetuate that. We know that in the Senate Agriculture Committee or the House Agriculture Committee. That is why we have the debates without apology and we try to make certain that heritage might flow.

All of these debates have to have some proportion to them. I started out by pointing out a \$5.5 billion supplemental will elevate income this year somewhere into the \$47, \$48 billion net as opposed to the \$45 we were aiming at. There is no magic about 5.5. The Budget Committee must have gone backward and forward on that subject for some time. But it gets the job done.

I conclude this particular thought by saying the Agriculture Committee of the Senate came forward with a package of expenditures that exceeds \$7.4 billion. The distinguished chairman of the committee, I am certain, will have more to say as to how the components were put together. Let me just say

from my own experience, not from his—he will have to explain how it happened this year—but as chairman of the committee for the previous 6 years, I was responsible for at least three of these situations. Essentially, you visit with members of the committee. They make suggestions for what ought to be a part of the package.

When we started these packages we were dealing with the traditions of agricultural farm bills which dealt with so-called program crops, programs that have gone on for a long time, since the 1930s and Franklin Roosevelt. The big four in this respect were corn and wheat and cotton and rice. They were programs because, in the 1930s, my dad and others were asked to destroy crops and hogs. At least that occurred on our farm. This was supply management with a vengeance. It was not just planning for the future, it was actual destruction of crops, and rows that were in the fields, and actual livestock at that point.

The philosophy was if you let farmers plant as much as they wanted to plant, inevitably they would plant too much. They simply would use their ingenuity, their land, their resources, and we would have an oversupply and depression of prices. Prices were very low during the beginning of the New Deal period. So the thought was supply management, but a program would come along with that. In other words, you became a member of the program. You worked so many acres, whatever the quantity was that you were dealing with, in return for assurance of payments, therefore a sustenance of your income. There is no reason why this should have gone on for over 60 years, but it did. It was an attractive idea.

In 1996, with this farm bill, we changed and we fulfilled perhaps the worst fears of those in the 1930s because we said Freedom to Farm means freedom to plant whatever you want to on your land; use those resources with your own ingenuity. A lot of farmers did. They made a variety of choices. By and large, less wheat has been planted in some years, more soybeans have been planted. That seemed to meet, really, world market conditions. People have been planting soybeans in different States more than they had been before. I suppose that may be true of cotton, but by and large, less cotton, seemingly, has been produced and perhaps less rice. It is a close call because these are large farms and there are fixed costs and many people have continued on, whether it was a program or not.

When we talked about our supplemental payments, when we began to plug these gaps, we went to the program crops because they have behind them a list of farmers, names and addresses, people who are part of the picture. If you are attempting to get money to people rapidly, checks could be cut to people who were known, with a name and address and a quantity behind their name in terms of planting expectations and history.

Some have come to the fore this year, and to some extent last year—really, I think, for the first time. They said: What about us? We are not in a program crop. As a matter of fact, we plant so-called specialty crops. We have melons, we have apples on trees, we have strawberries and raspberries—and we have problems. If you think people in rice country have problems, you ought to see our problems.

In the old days—and by that I mean, say, the last 10 years—essentially many of those problems were met by the Senate Appropriations Committee. The appropriations subcommittee came along at a time of year in which the weather disasters of the winter or spring or much of the summer, sometimes, were apparent. They made an appeal to the Senate. They said there has been very bad luck in this State or this district or with this crop and therefore we ought to do something about it in an emergency, compassionate sense. Each of us have been voting for these programs for years. I cannot recall those pleas being rejected.

But the so-called specialty situations were enveloped in this. Why? Because it was very difficult to find out the crop histories of people who were involved in melons, for example, or in raspberries. Is there anywhere a 5-year idea or any idea of support payments or so forth? The answer in most cases was no. This means, if you get into melons, the USDA has to formulate a new program. It has to determine who really is eligible. That takes time.

We found that out last year. We had a supplemental. It came along as a part of legislation to strengthen and reform the Federal Crop Insurance Program. That was not totally inadvertent. Agriculture usually has sort of one shot on the floor each year and we had been working on crop insurance reform for some time. It was contentious all by itself, among various groups, as well as the total amount.

Senators, I think, have been advised—they probably understand—that the crop insurance program we strengthened as a result of last year's legislation is a generous one. It was a safety net. It will probably cost an average of \$2.9 to \$3 billion. That is not a supplemental, it is just there. It will go on permanently.

I would say from personal experience, I have purchased the 85-percent level of insurance coverage on the income of my corn and on my soybeans. Many people in Indiana, I have found, have not gone to the 85 percent because either they have not discovered it or they do not really understand why that is such a good deal. But I would say arithmetically this is a remarkable way of ensuring income, even without the supplemental.

Without getting into an advertisement for crop insurance, nevertheless it is there, and it is important, but not everybody in the Senate sought crop insurance as a priority item. They un-

derstood the pleas of those of us from the Midwest and the plains States. They saw some of the difficulties in the South with the program crops. But they said we are from New England—for example. Or we are from States which have never been involved in program crops. What are you going to do for us?

As a result, we had, in addition to crop insurance, the supplemental. The supplemental last year included, for the first time, a number of crops at least that I do not recall being a part of these emergency actions before. As predicted, the checks went out right on time to the so-called AMTA payment recipients—the program crop people. That is quite a number, probably a majority of farmers in our country, in terms of income and acreage. So that was not inconsequential.

We have had testimony, as the Chair knows, in our committee, the Ag Committee, from farmers who said the check got there just in time. So did the country banker testify that it got there in time. The farmer met the banker, repaid the planting loan, was in business again to try again in the year 2001. What seemed to be a potential crisis was alleviated just in time. But with the rest of the group who were not program people, the checks did not come quite so fast. USDA really had to work out the details of a good number of complex programs.

As a matter of fact, in February, March, even April of this year, those qualified were finally being identified. Weeks later, in some cases, the checks finally came that were being sent to them. In many cases, that is being cited with regard to the bill we passed in the Senate Agriculture Committee.

There is a large component, once again, either in the bill for which the distinguished chairman from Iowa and I were present, which was adopted 12-9 in the committee, or in the amendment that I offered, which had a \$5.5 billion limit, which was rejected by this 12-9 vote. Both of us had a fairly large component of that in the so-called program crops. In large part, if we are talking about money being dispensed in this calendar year, this is about the only group of people likely to see a check because they can be identified as they were the year before and the year before that.

In the event people come along then and suggest there are other situations, this means they spill over. This is a part of the debate over the additional \$1.9 billion to \$2 billion. Some would say that is all the spillover from the year before because they were busy attempting to do these things. This year the Budget Committee of the Senate mentioned \$5.5 billion. The Office of Management and Budget, through its Director, Mr. Daniels, more pointedly mentioned \$5.5 billion in his correspondence with the House committee. Who took that seriously? The distinguished chairman of the committee offered a package of \$6.5 billion,

but the members of the committee, led, as it turned out, by the distinguished ranking member, Mr. STENHOLM, from Texas and Mr. BOEHNER, a Republican from Ohio, and others reversed that decision. They came out at \$5.5 billion, and the House, as a whole, adopted that without rigorous dissent.

All of this could have been adopted by the Senate a month ago. But it was not adopted. A month has transpired in the meanwhile, and in the same way that I collected sentiments a year ago, the distinguished chairman of the committee has collected those sentiments again this year. They add up to \$7.4 billion. There is no magic in that figure, and one would say no magic in the \$5.5 billion. The whole exercise was attempting to plug a gap between the \$42.4 billion in net farm income that was estimated this year and the \$45 billion average we have achieved in recent years. The \$5.5 billion will get us there. It gets up close to \$48 billion, as a matter of fact. The Director of the OMB, Mr. Daniels, has written that. He pointed out, and he even offered some charts in his letter to the chairman of the committee, to me, to the chairman of the Budget Committee, to the ranking member, to Senator DASCHLE, and to Senator LOTT. To the extent we have shared that correspondence with Members, they know the argument of the administration.

We could say after all that the administration has their view and we have ours. Honest people can differ. We are all trying to do the best we can for agriculture.

I made the comment—it has been repeated in the press—about our public deliberations the other day in the Agriculture Committee. Is it really the intent of our committee of the Senate to taunt the President, and say, Mr. President, regardless of what you and your OMB Director and others may have to say about this, we want to do more than you want to do? We really feel more deeply about the farmers than you do. So, by golly, even though it is pretty clear that all of this may lead to zero at the end of the trail, we are going to have a go at it. We really do not believe you will veto it. We think when it comes to agriculture that your heart is in the right place. So is that of the American people generally. So whether the figure is \$5.5 billion, \$6.1 billion, or \$7.1 billion, maybe, for all I know, in conference there will be a larger figure. That is the way these things go. They never have too much discipline or form to them. They just sort of add up so you can get enough people on board to get a majority, and hopefully, in fact, the big majority. Maybe that was the intent, but I doubt it. I think the intent of our committee in the Senate and the House committee is, in fact, to get money to farmers by September 30 so that they will have successful meetings with the country bankers; so that our intent that no family farm should fail will, in fact, happen and they, in fact, stay

alive and stay in business even in difficult times.

Meanwhile, both Houses think about larger farm bills which may go on for many years. The House of Representatives' committee acted on one last Friday, which was a significant bill. The House will still need to debate that. Obviously, our debate lies ahead.

These are important times not to be confused with the supplemental bill that we have at the present for emergency activity for money to be dispensed by September 30. But I take the time of the Chair and my colleagues this afternoon to recite all of this to give at least, as I see it, some background for this enterprise, why we are involved in it at all, to what extent the effects are, if you add up the figures, and what I perceive to be the dynamics of the political situation, if there is one in this.

My hope is that at the end of the debate—I hope we will have one, and, as I indicated when I started, I will certainly vote for cloture on the motion to proceed so we can proceed—the leaders will formulate a program for that process. I am hopeful that I will be recognized fairly early in the debate to offer what I believe to be a constructive amendment that I think will lead to rapid resolution and reconciliation with the House of Representatives and some hope for farmers out there that this is not going to be an interesting debate among Senators but rather a kickoff of activity in a week that some Senators characterize as the fairly slow beginning given the urgency of a number of topics that we need to discuss.

I am optimistic as always. I am sure the Chair shares that optimism and desire for constructive activity. During this rather calm hiatus before the debate really begins, technically, as the Chair knows, we are discussing really whether to proceed. I come out in favor of that. I hope my colleagues will, too. But, after we have proceeded, we need to have at least some framework I believe of how to manage this situation. I look forward to those hours ahead and a constructive result.

I do not see other Senators. Therefore, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I rise to address the Agriculture supplemental assistance bill and to answer some of the critics I have heard from the other side with respect to this legislation.

As chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, I follow the budget issues very closely and have the responsibility for determining if a budget point of order exists against any legislation. We have heard from a number of our

colleagues that the legislation before us somehow busts the budget. That is just wrong. That is not true. This legislation does not bust the budget. It is entirely in keeping with the budget resolution. There is no budget point of order that exists against this bill. Those are all facts.

Mr. President, if we look at the legislation before us, it provides \$5.5 billion in fiscal year 2001. That is exactly what is provided for in the budget resolution. In fiscal year 2002, this legislation provides \$1.9 billion. The committee is actually authorized \$7.35 billion. So there still remains \$5.45 billion available to the committee, available to the Congress, next year.

Mr. President, the fact is, this legislation is entirely in keeping with the budget resolution. There is no budget point of order against it. This does not bust the budget, this is in keeping with the budget. Those are the facts. I challenge anyone who has a different view to come out here and raise a budget point of order against this legislation. If they really believe what they have been saying, come out here and raise a budget point of order against this bill because there is no budget point of order—none. This bill is entirely within the budget, and there is no budget point of order against this bill.

Mr. President, if one has any questions about the design of this bill, I suggest they go to the resolution on the budget that was passed here in the Congress. This is the conference report. This is what came out of the conference between the House and the Senate in the final budget resolution. When you go to the part of that report that deals with the issue before us, it says—and I have highlighted it—it says:

It is assumed that the additional funds for 2001 and 2002 will address low-income concerns in the agriculture sector today.

Not in the sweet by and by—today. That is what this bill does. It deals with the collapse of farm income that is happening today. I must say, when I hear some colleagues stand on the floor and say things are getting better in agriculture, I don't know what agriculture they are talking about. Maybe they are taking about Argentina or China. They are not talking about America because if you ask the American farmer what is happening today, they will tell you what is happening is a disaster—a disaster of collapsing incomes that threatens to force tens of thousands of farm families off of the land. That is what is happening.

This idea that somehow prices are escalating dramatically and all of a sudden there are good times ahead is just plain wrong. What are they talking about? They aren't talking about agriculture in my State. Go to the grain elevator in North Dakota and see what wheat is selling for. Has it gone up a little bit? Yes, it has gone up a little bit. Is it anywhere close to the cost of

production? No. I mean, it is almost farcical. Have prices gone up a little? Yes, they have. Are they still so far underwater you can't possibly make a farm operation add up? Absolutely. We all know it is true, any of us who represents agricultural America; and I must say the distinguished occupant of the chair, the Senator from Minnesota, knows exactly what I am talking about.

The Senator from Minnesota, Mr. DAYTON, has had a chance to go town to town, community to community, farm to farm, and he knows what I am saying is true because farmers all across the Dakotas, across Minnesota, tell us the same thing: These are as tough a times as they have ever faced. They tell us weekend after weekend, break period after break period: If you guys don't do something in Washington, we are all going to go bust. We are going to be broke. We are going to be forced off the land because this doesn't add up.

When you look at the cost of the things that they buy versus the prices they get when they sell, there is no way of making it add up. That is what this bill is about. This bill is to provide emergency assistance for farmers who are struggling. It does it just in line with what the budget resolution called for.

It is assumed that the additional funds for 2001 and 2002 will address low-income concerns in the agricultural sector today.

That is the wording of the budget resolution. It goes on to say:

Fiscal year 2003 monies may be made available for 2002 crop year support.

That is a very important thing to understand. Why is it that we have a circumstance in which in this bill we pass in 2001, that we not only deal with 2001 expenditures, but we also deal with 2002 expenditures? Why do we do that? Very simply because there is a difference between the fiscal year and a crop-year. Every farmer knows it. Every member of the Agriculture Committee knows it. Others may not know it. So it is easier to confuse the circumstance. But we have always, in every disaster bill since I have been a Member of this body—and I am in my fifteenth year—when we have dealt with an agricultural disaster, some of the assistance comes from one fiscal year and some comes in the next fiscal year because that is the way crop-years work. Crop-years don't just neatly fall in the same fiscal year. That isn't the way it works.

When there is a disaster, it doesn't just have an effect until September 30 of a year. That is when our Federal fiscal year ends. It affects before September 30. That is why we have some money in fiscal 2001, and some of it has an effect after September 30, as harvest is completed, and that is why we have some of the money in fiscal 2002.

Let anybody have any misunderstanding, that is exactly what the budget resolution recognizes. It says it about as clearly as it can be said:

Fiscal year 2003 monies may be made available for 2002 crop year support.

That is exactly what we are doing with 2002 and 2001. Some of the money is in Federal fiscal year 2001; some is in Federal fiscal year 2002, just as you would anticipate. That is exactly what this legislation provides.

Mr. President, again, I want to go back to the fundamental and basic point for any of our colleagues who are listening and wondering about the critiques they have heard. Is it true that this busts the budget? Absolutely not. The budget says \$5.5 billion is available to the Agriculture Committee under their allocation. And the funding that is provided in this assistance package for fiscal year 2001 is \$5.5 billion—exactly what is provided for in the budget. For fiscal year 2002, the Agriculture Committee has been allocated \$7.35 billion.

This legislation, quite appropriately, uses \$1.9 billion of that amount. There is absolutely nothing wrong with what is being done here. It does not bust the budget. It does not add \$2 billion to the overall cost of the agricultural budget that has been provided for in the next 2 years. It does not add one thin dime to what was provided for in the budget resolution. It does not add a penny to what was provided for in the budget resolution. It is exactly what the budget resolution calls for: \$5.5 billion in fiscal year 2001.

This costs \$5.5 billion. In 2002, the budget resolution provides \$7.35 billion. Of that, \$1.9 billion is used, leaving \$5.45 billion next year. That is not going to be a problem.

Why is it not going to be a problem? Very simply, because of the difference between fiscal years and crop years. We are going to have a very short period of time that has to be covered in the next fiscal year because of the difference between a fiscal year and a crop year and the fact that we are writing a new Federal farm bill.

It is very clear in the budget resolution, for anybody who bothers to read it: "Fiscal year 2003 monies may be made available for 2002 crop year support." By doing what we are doing, using the money allocated for 2001 as provided for in the budget resolution and using some of the money that is available in 2002 for 2002, with the anticipation we can use 2003 fiscal year money to deal with the 2002 crop year, that is exactly what is being done in this legislation. No harm, no foul. That is exactly what we have here. There is no harm. There is no foul.

This is completely in keeping with the budget resolution. There is no budget point of order against this legislation. If anybody challenges that, they have an opportunity. They can come out and raise a budget point of order and see what the Parliamentarian says. The Parliamentarian will tell them there is no budget point of order against this bill—none, zero—because it is entirely in keeping with the budget resolution.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I rise to voice my concerns about this Agricultural supplemental appropriations bill. I believe reaching forward into next year to spend an additional \$2 billion is fiscally irresponsible and, frankly, unnecessary. Even though some of that \$2 billion in additional spending will benefit farmers in my State, I do not believe at a time when we are debating issues of great importance—Medicare prescription drugs, Social Security, other issues such as that, where we are going to be needing resources to solve those problems—reaching forward to next year, when we are going to be doing a farm bill next year, to allocate those resources is the wise course to take.

I do not want you to take my word for it. We have just received a Statement of Administration Policy about this legislation. I want to quote from it:

The Administration strongly opposes S. 1246 as reported by the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry because spending authorized by the bill would exceed \$5.5 billion, the amount provided in the budget resolution and the amount adopted by the House. If S. 1246 is presented to the President at a level higher than \$5.5 billion, the President's senior advisers will recommend he veto the bill.

We are about to engage here in a motion to proceed. If this scenario plays out, with the objections that I intend to have to this bill and I know others on this side will have, we will not get around in any way, shape, or form to final passage of this bill until Friday, Saturday, sometime Sunday.

It can all go away. From my perspective, it can all go away. If we stop this overreaching and get back to the budget number of \$5.5 billion and we get to the House number of \$5.5 billion, we can pass a bill here and, I hope, in a relatively expeditious time. Certainly from my perspective I will not have objections to moving forward. There may be amendments offered, and I certainly want to reserve my right to object if there are amendments offered, but the idea we are going to spend all week here, probably past the time the House of Representatives will even be in session, and pass a bill that the House will not even be here to deal with—it may not even get to the President—and we get no ag assistance at this point in time is irresponsible. To overreach to the point we get nothing at a time when certainly there are some ag needs out there, that is, in my view, an irresponsible action.

I am hopeful with this word from the President, with I think a very strong conviction of many of us on this side of the aisle that this additional spending is not only unnecessary but unwise, we can get this bill done in a rapid, orderly fashion and get it done to a level that has been approved by the Budget Committee and the authorizing committee and move forward and get ag assistance out before the House of Representatives leaves and get a bill that will be signed by the President.

If we go to the \$7.5 billion level, I tell you we will be here all week. We will be here past the time the House of Representatives will be in session. And it will be met with a veto by the President.

I am willing to do that. But we are not going to get any ag assistance to people anytime soon if we do that.

I am happy to yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. I thank the Senator for yielding. I am sorry the Senator is still not a member of the Agriculture Committee. He was a very valuable member.

Mr. SANTORUM. I am sorry, too. It is the cost of leadership on our side.

Mr. HARKIN. I am sorry he is not there because he comes from a very important agricultural State.

I say to my friend from Pennsylvania, I have tried to make it clear, again, this Agriculture Committee, in accordance with the budget, spent \$5.5 billion this fiscal year, before September 30. The Budget Committee allows the Agriculture Committee to spend up to \$7.35 billion in fiscal year 2002, which begins on October 1. There are no instructions in the Budget Committee that say we cannot meet until after that to decide how to spend that \$7.35 billion.

There is no reaching forward. There is no moving money from one fiscal year to another, I say to my friend from Pennsylvania. This committee recognized that fiscal years and crop years do not coincide. So what the committee did, because of the press of business, what is happening this fall, since we don't know when the next farm bill is going to be done, and in accordance with the budget resolution, was to obligate \$2 billion of the \$7.35 billion for next year to be spent in 2002. So the money is coming out of the \$7.35 billion for fiscal year 2002. It is not being forward funded. There is no moving money from one fiscal year to the other. It was just a recognition that many of the problems that farmers face this fall, in November or December or January, are the result of the crop year that came before it and the crop years and the fiscal years do not coincide on the same date. I just say that to my friend.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I appreciate the comments of the Senator from Iowa.

A couple of comments:

No. 1, the President's advisers have advised the President to veto this bill

because of the obligation of this 2002 money and this additional \$2 billion of obligations. We received this a few minutes ago. I will read it to you again.

The administration strongly opposes S. 1246 as reported by the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, because spending authorized by the bill would exceed \$5.5 billion, the amount provided in the budget resolution and the amount adopted by the House. If S. 1246 is presented to the President at a level higher than \$5.5 billion, the President's senior advisers will recommend that he veto the bill.

I understand the idea of reaching forward and obligating money. The problem I have is we are now obligating money that is going to start to be spent October 1.

I have been around here long enough to know that we will be here next year, and we will have another emergency. And the \$5 billion left over isn't going to be enough and we will either try to bump that up or reach for the next year and try to draw out some money.

If I can have assurances that this isn't just a continual practice—which I know it will be, if we allow this to occur and we will just in a sense begin reaching more and more into the following year to make up for it in this crop-year. That is not what the Budget Committee suggested. They said we want \$5.5 billion. If we have a farm bill coming up next year, we have authorization for \$7.3 billion, let's go through the working process of doing that in the fiscal year in which we intend to do it. But to reach and grab, if you want to obligate, why not obligate the whole \$7.3 billion, if there is no big deal about it. The fact is, we have a responsibility under the farm bill to change farm policy. Use that \$7.3 billion to implement that change. There will be some changes, as I am sure the Senator knows, in farm policy. What we have done now is to limit our ability to make that happen. I do not think that is wise. Whether I think it is wise or not is somewhat relevant in this body, but what is more relevant is the fact that the President's advisers will recommend that he veto this bill.

If we don't get aid to the farm country right now in this fiscal year, the best course of business is to scale this bill back and put the \$5.5 billion out to the farm country. We either adopt the House bill or we pass \$5.5 billion here in conference. There may be some policy differences that we may want to work out. That is the best way to do it.

There would be much more cooperation from many of us on this side of the aisle who would like to see some agricultural assistance. If I could read further from the Statement of Administration Policy, it says:

The budget resolution provides \$5.5 billion for 2001, an amount that the Administration strongly believes is more than adequate for this crop year. Moreover, improvements in agricultural markets and stronger livestock and crop prices means that the need for additional federal assistance continues to diminish. An additional \$5.5 billion in federal as-

sistance will boast expected real U.S. farm net-cash income to \$53.6 billion in 1996 dollars, a level of income significantly above the previous two years.

Having been on the Agriculture Committee, I remember when we had this discussion. Our objective was to keep net-cash farm income at the 1996 level of \$45 billion.

I ask the Senator from Iowa if he remembers that also. But the number we had always targeted was \$45 billion in net-cash farm income.

Here we are with this supplemental at \$53.6 billion. We are talking about 20 percent above what we thought was the projected level of income that we wanted to set as a floor. Now above that we want to throw on another \$2 billion.

All I am asking is when is enough enough? I think \$5.5 billion is more than generous. It is not the way I would want to spend it. That is why I hope we can maybe do some amendments to this bill. Almost 99 percent of the \$5.5 billion is spent this year on AMTA payments. I understand that is an easy way to get out the money. But it isn't necessarily a regionally fair way to get out the money.

I see the Senator from Vermont. The Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Pennsylvania consider agriculture pretty important to our States. It is the No. 1 industry in my State. It is either No. 1 or No. 2 in his State. But I will guarantee that the level of AMTA payments in our State is probably a third or less of what it is in Iowa, and certainly North Dakota and a lot of other Midwestern row-crop States. Putting all of that money in AMTA doesn't help us much. It doesn't help the Senator from Vermont or the Senator from Pennsylvania. It doesn't help the Senator from Massachusetts or anybody else who has farmers who aren't in the big row crops.

I suggest that we step back and try to put together a bill that is regionally fair and that meets the budget target we set out. Then we can get a bill that I think can pass in a bipartisan fashion that will be signed by this President and really do something about the need in some areas of farm country to help stabilize that economy.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. I suggest the absence of a quorum. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I know our time has expired.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HARKIN. How much time do we have before the vote?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Three and a half minutes.

Mr. HARKIN. I ask unanimous consent to have a couple of minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I wish to, again, respond to my friend from Pennsylvania and to a Statement of Administration Policy that we have just received. It is not from the President. I don't really know what to make of this letter. It said they opposed the bill that we have before us because spending authorized by the bill would exceed \$5.5 billion, the amount provided in the budget resolution and the amount adopted by the House. It is the amount adopted by the House, but it is not the amount provided in the budget resolution. The budget resolution provided two amounts: \$5.5 billion this year and \$7.35 billion next year. We stayed within the \$5.5 billion for this year. Then we had \$7.35 billion for next year.

The administration is saying we can't spend what the budget resolution provides. The administration has nothing to do with this. This is something that is internal to the Congress.

If we are meeting our budget obligations, why should the administration care? Evidently, the administration must be opposed to how we are spending the money. How are we spending the money? In the next fiscal year we are spending money on a lot of our specialty crops such as apples.

I mentioned in my earlier talk about how our apple farmers are being hurt. We heard that the livestock sector is rebounding. But that doesn't mean the crop sector is rebounding. Far from it. We have specialty crops in peas and lentils. I mentioned apples. We have a lot of other specialty crops that are in dire need of assistance all over this country.

This bill is much fairer region to region than the House bill. The House bill focused on a few crops but not on the entire country. That is why I do not understand the administration's objection to this. They say the bill provides funding for a number of programs that have nothing to do with farmers' 2001 incomes. It sure as heck does. Ask all the apple farmers in Washington State, in Maine, in Pennsylvania, in New York, and in Massachusetts. It has a lot to do with the 2001 income.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 1 minute 20 seconds.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I would like to address the point of the Senator from Iowa. At least three components of this bill have nothing to do with farm income. One establishes a scientific research unit in USDA. It provides additional funding for business and industry. It provides that U.S. cities with populations not exceeding 50,000 will be eligible for guaranteed community facility costs.

That has nothing to do with emergency farm income this year. This is just another vehicle to try to do some more agricultural authorization. I am

not against doing agricultural authorization. I loved being on the Agriculture Committee. But we should do it in a farm bill and not in an emergency supplemental bill for agriculture. No. 2, the fact is, I think the Senator has received letters from the White House and previous administrations where they said: Senior advisers will recommend that the President veto the bill. Unfortunately, we get those all too often around here.

I think it is very clear that the President and his advisers do not like the way this bill was constructed and would prefer to see us live within the requirements of the budget agreement for the year 2001. I think we can do that, and we should do that. It is the only way I believe we will actually get a bill done this year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close the debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 102, S. 1246, a bill to respond to the continuing economic crisis adversely affecting American farmers:

Tom Harkin, Harry Reid, Jon S. Corzine, Max Baucus, Patty Murray, Hillary Rodham Clinton, Jeff Bingaman, Tim Johnson, Ted Kennedy, Jay Rockefeller, Daniel K. Akaka, Paul Wellstone, Mark Dayton, Maria Cantwell, Benjamin Nelson, Blanche Lincoln, Richard Durbin, Herb Kohl.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call under the rule has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to S. 1246, a bill to respond to the continuing economic crisis adversely affecting American farmers, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are required under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. TORRICELLI) is necessarily absent.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) and the Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT) are necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 95, nays 2, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 260 Leg.]

YEAS—95

Akaka	Dorgan	Lugar
Allard	Durbin	McConnell
Allen	Edwards	Mikulski
Baucus	Enzi	Miller
Bayh	Feingold	Murkowski
Biden	Feinstein	Murray
Bingaman	Fitzgerald	Nelson (FL)
Bond	Frist	Nelson (NE)
Boxer	Graham	Nickles
Breaux	Gramm	Reed
Brownback	Grassley	Reid
Bunning	Hagel	Roberts
Burns	Harkin	Rockefeller
Byrd	Hatch	Santorum
Campbell	Helms	Sarbanes
Cantwell	Hollings	Schumer
Carnahan	Hutchinson	Sessions
Carper	Hutchison	Shelby
Chafee	Inhofe	Smith (NH)
Cleland	Inouye	Smith (OR)
Clinton	Jeffords	Snowe
Cochran	Johnson	Specter
Collins	Kennedy	Stabenow
Conrad	Kerry	Stevens
Corzine	Kohl	Thomas
Craig	Kyl	Thompson
Crapo	Landrieu	Thurmond
Daschle	Leahy	Voinovich
Dayton	Levin	Warner
DeWine	Lieberman	Wellstone
Dodd	Lincoln	Wyden
Domenici	Lott	

NAYS—2

Ensign

Gregg

NOT VOTING—3

Bennett

McCain

Torricelli

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote the yeas are 95, the nays are 2. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DASCHLE. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the motion to proceed to S. 1246 be adopted and the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each; that the Senate resume consideration of the Agriculture supplemental bill, S. 1246, at 9:30 a.m. on Tuesday, July 31, and that Senator LUGAR be recognized to offer an amendment, the text of the House-passed bill; further, that no cloture motion against the bill, or any amendments, be in order prior to Wednesday, August 1.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LUGAR. Madam President, reserving the right to object, and I will not object, I simply thank the majority leader for this motion. It sets us off on a constructive path for consideration of this bill, and it offers an opportunity for me to present an amendment, which I am prepared to do. We look forward to working with him. I do not object.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, let me thank the distinguished ranking member and the chairman for their excellent work in getting the Senate to this point. I appreciate very much Senator LUGAR's interest in pursuing this amendment. We will have a good debate on it. We don't know how long the debate will last, but we will certainly leave it to him to make some decision in that regard tomorrow morning.

Tomorrow is Tuesday. We have 4 days within which to do a tremendous amount of work. I ask the cooperation of all of our colleagues. We need to finish this bill, and that will entail, of course, working through some very difficult questions not only with regard to the level of funding but also perhaps the dairy issue and other questions about which I know Senators are concerned. We also have to finish the Transportation bill, and of course, the Export Administration Act expires in August. The distinguished Presiding Officer addressed that point last week. We would like to do HUD-VA. There is a lot to be done.

Tomorrow night our Republican colleagues have an event and we will attempt to accommodate that event tomorrow night. I appreciate very much the minority leader's cooperation in allowing us to move to the bill as quickly as we have. That will at least accelerate the opportunity for debate and hopefully allow us to address some of these questions as quickly as possible. It will be a busy week.

I will say now, so there is no surprise if we are not finished at least with the Export Administration Act, the Transportation bill and the Agriculture supplemental bill by Friday, we will need the weekend and we will need additional days. That is an unfortunate but certainly accurate statement. I am hopeful that will not be necessary, but I want Senators who have traveling plans to take that into account because this work must be done. I thank all of my colleagues.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. I seek recognition in morning business for 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. DURBIN. This weekend, the New York Times Sunday edition had a front